

52



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/976,322	11/21/1997	KIMMO DJUPSJOBACKA	915-312	1733

4955 7590 03/24/2004

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/976,322

Applicant(s)

DJUPSJOBACKA ET AL.

Examiner

Reuben M. Brown

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/22/2003 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Generally, examiner points out that the notion of representing numeric identification that identifies a service that is found on a network, as a textual non-numeric entity is consistent with the main concept of the Internet. In other words a user of the Internet enters a textual (usually non-numeric) name that is converted to a numeric ID and matched with its network location by the DNS.

Eyer is directed to retrieving a video service using a HTML/HTVP technology. Thus the user in Eyer enters a URL, (non-numeric identifier) that is used by the system to retrieve the appropriate video service. Notwithstanding applicant's assertion on page 12, the URL used in Eyer reads on a non-numeric textual identifier that represents a video service; see page 3, lines 32-58 & col. 7.

Eyer does not explicitly talk about the transmission algorithm. However, Terasawa starts with a teaching of representing programming on various networks in a textual non-numeric format; see col. 8, lines 25-67. Furthermore, APA page 6, teaches that is desirable to represent the address of video program in a textual non-numeric, on a transport stream, which is itself located with respect to its network ID. Thus the combination of references would still read on the claimed subject matter, since the content being retrieved in both Terasawa & APA, page 6 are broadcast programs, within a broadcast transport stream, from a broadcast network ID.

Applicant agrees that, "regarding the APA, the APA does discuss a worldwide identification algorithm for service identification data". However, applicant asserts that the combination of Eyer does not suggest the claimed non-numeric worldwide information for retrieving those service identifications. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2611

Furthermore, Eyer col. 8, lines 1-30 discloses that “the HTML/HTVP data may provide unrelated information such as stock quotes, weather information, airline travel schedules or virtually any resource which is constructed with HTML”. While Eyer does disclose the embodiment of the HTML/HTVP identifying/controlling various local TV functions, this format is also useful for accessing TV services over a network. Thus the combination of Terasawa, APA & Eyer, would provide to one of ordinary skill in the art, a means for using a global textual format to identify TV services within a transport stream of TV services, being delivered to a user and accessible by the user.

As for applicant’s argument regarding a motivation to combine, Eyer col. 4, line 1 & lines 9-17, teaches that it would be advantageous to retrieve TV services using an HTML format, which reads on a non-numeric globally worldwide identification, since this format utilizes the well-known URL technology, also see col. 3, lines 19-55.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2611

4. Claims 2-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa, (U.S. Pat # 6,147,714), in view of Admitted Prior Art, (APA, page 6, lines 1-10) and Eyer, (U.S. Pat # 5,982,445).

Considering claims 2 & 19, the amended claimed method for addressing at least one broadcast service in a data communication system including at least one data transmission network for transmitting information in at least one data transmission stream, such that one or more service providers transmits services to one or more data transmission networks, wherein the services are assigned service ID data is met by Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 40-50), which discusses a service ID that is provided as a label for a particular service within a transport stream.

The amended claimed service ID identifying an original transmission network, reads on the disclosed original network ID (original_network_id(2)), see col. 8, lines 32-33. Also Terasawa more generally discloses a parameter, the Service Provider Item, discussed in Terasawa, (Fig. 13). The Service Provider identifies the provider, i.e. the original network that provides the particular service, col. 7, lines 58-62.

The claimed broadcast service ID identifying a broadcast transmission stream from the broadcast service provider reads on Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 28-34), which discusses the broadcast transport stream ID. Terasawa (col. 8, lines 40-50) meets the claimed broadcast service ID identifying the service within the stream.

As for the amended claimed feature of the textual worldwide globally individual name of broadcast services, Terasawa teaches that identification data uniquely identifies the broadcast services within the network, using the DVB definitions, but does not explicitly discuss a worldwide identification algorithm (Fig. 4; Fig. 8; col. 7, lines 59-62). However Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 discloses that it is advantageous to represent the DVB definitions within the format of a URL. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa to use worldwide identification algorithm, as disclosed by Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10, at least for the desirable benefit of uniquely identifying broadcast services across a worldwide network.

However, Terasawa & Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 utilizes a numerical identification format, instead of the claimed non-numeric textual worldwide global identification method. Nevertheless, Eyer discloses the benefits of using the well-known HTML format of a URL address for identifying additional TV programming services, see col. 3, lines 17-15 & col. 4, lines 40-50.

In particular, Eyer teaches the advantages of expanding the generic hypertext markup language, for instance such as a HTVP, which enables unique functions of a set top system that may be controlled using the Internet, being identified according to a URL, (col. 11, lines 35-67 & 12, lines 1-40), which reads on the claimed non-numerical worldwide global identification. Eyer also discloses enabling the subscriber to retrieve a variety of TV services, using the same format,

Art Unit: 2611

col. 7, lines 10-15. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination Terasawa & Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 to use a textual worldwide identification algorithm, as disclosed by Eyer at least for the known benefit of a more user friendly technique, since consumers are more familiar with a textual identification format, which enables the user to identify TV services using the standard URL format, see col. 3, lines 19-55 & col. 4, lines 8-20.

Regarding claim 2, the claimed method for addressing at least one broadcast service among plural broadcast services or for addressing at least *one service component*, recites method steps that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 3 & 16, Terasawa utilizes DVB technology, col. 4, lines 62-67 & col. 7, lines 55-57.

Considering claims 4-5 & 17-18, Terasawa discloses that the service name information is added to both a SDT table records and EIT table records, see col. 7, lines 55-67; col. 8, lines 1-67.

Considering claim 6, Terasawa discloses the use of the service_name and service_provider_name fields, col. 8, lines 61-67.

Considering claims 10-11, the claimed data communication system comprising at least one data transmission network for transmitting information on services in at least one data transmission stream, recites features that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 12-13, the claimed broadcasting device for transmitting at least on service in a data communication system comprising at least one data transmission network for transmission of information in at least one data transmission stream, recites features that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 14-15, the claimed receiver for receiving at least one service in a data communication system comprising at least one data transmission network for transmission of information in at least one data transmission stream, recites features that correspond with subject matter rejected above in the analysis of claim 2, and is likewise analyzed.

Considering claims 7-8, Terasawa does not mention the use of DSM-CC technology. Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, DSM-CC technology was well known as a standard set of protocols for managing functions and operations of at least MPEG-1 & MPEG-2 bitstreams. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2611

time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa with the features of DSM-CC technology, at least for the known benefits of increased command and control from a server to a client.

Considering claim 9, Admitted Prior Art, page 6, lines 1-10 & Eyer discloses using URL technology.

Considering claim 20, the claimed recitation is met by the use of the Internet discussed in Eyer.

Considering claims 21 & 22, Terasawa discusses using MPEG transmission streams, col. 3, lines 65-67.

Considering claims 23-24, the claimed method of addressing at least one service in the data communication system comprises steps that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claims 2 & 10, and are likewise treated.

Art Unit: 2611

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington,
VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-2399.
The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Andrew I. Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 for regular
communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Reuben M. Brown



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER